

OCT 25 1927

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of
March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXI, No. 3

MONDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1927

WHOLE No. 560

Good reading for the first three semesters of Latin

Books that the teacher will welcome

JULIA: A Latin Reading Book. By Maud Reed.

Very easy reading, for first semester. Contains eighteen short stories of ancient Greece and Rome.....\$0.48

LEGENDS OF GODS AND HEROES. By T. S. Morton.

Tales from Greek mythology for very first reading.....\$0.60

ORA MARITIMA. By E. A. Sonnenschein.

A continuous narrative of interest, free from syntactical difficulties, for first semester reading.....\$0.60

CAMILLA: A Latin Reading Book. By Maud Reed.

A companion to JULIA, designed for second semester reading. It comprises classical stories of Roman life and mythology.....\$0.48

THE SEVEN KINGS OF ROME. By G. H. Nall.

Extracts from Livy's History of Rome, simplified for reading in second or third semester work.....\$0.60

LEGENDS OF ANCIENT ROME. By Herbert Wilkinson.

Further selections from Livy's History of Rome, carrying the story on. Simplified for second or third semester work.....\$0.60

THE HELVETIAN WAR. By W. Welch and C. G. Duffield.

Selections from Caesar's Gallic War, Book One, grouped into 44 short lessons for third semester reading.....\$0.48

INVASION OF BRITAIN. By W. Welch and C. G. Duffield.

Passages from Books IV and V of Caesar's Gallic War.....\$0.48

Send for new illustrated catalogue of books in Ancient Languages for High Schools

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

Atlanta

Dallas

San Francisco

Place's Second Year Latin

By PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE, *Professor of Latin, Syracuse University. Author of "Beginning Latin"*
596 PAGES ILLUSTRATED. PRICE, \$1.68

THIS book reduces the difficulties in the reading of Caesar. The Introductory lessons lay stress on the syntactical principles not covered in First Year Latin, which need to be known by the student. Each chapter of this part ends with an easy Latin story applying the principles taught.

The "Training Camp" provides an intensive study of the first twenty chapters of Caesar's Gallic War. In the main part of the book the most significant portions of the text of the entire Gallic War are given,

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

JUNIOR LATIN LESSONS

BY D'OOGHE AND ROEHM

Book One

Short, easy lessons presenting only the 17 simplest constructions. Much connected Latin—dialogues, myths, and stories. Interesting diversions. Many beautiful illustrations. \$1.36



Book Two

An abundance of connected reading, including a Latin play. Much emphasis on derivation. More Latin songs. Frequent reviews. More beautiful pictures. \$1.56

In accord with the recommendations of the Classical Investigation

NEW YORK

GINN AND COMPANY

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

DALLAS

COLUMBUS

SAN FRANCISCO

LONDON

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XXI, No. 3

MONDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1927

WHOLE No. 560

THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

Twenty-two Recent Editions

(Continued from page 11)

(12) Plutarch, *Lives*, Volume XI. By Bernadotte Perrin (1926). Pp. v + 493.

This volume contains text and translation of the Aratus (1-125), Artaxerxes (127-203), Galba (205-273), Otho (275-319), and a General Index <of Names and Subjects> to all the *Lives* (321-493). The Index is by Professor J. W. Cohoon, of Mt. Allison University, Sackville, New Brunswick, Canada.

Notices of the earlier volumes of the late Professor Perrin's translation of Plutarch may be found in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7.192, 12.58, 13.146-147, 15.187.

There is nothing whatever in the present volume to show that it is a posthumous publication. Professor Perrin was fortunate indeed in being able to complete, in spite of serious physical handicaps, a translation of all the 'Parallel Lives' of Plutarch—truly a monumental achievement.

(13) Plutarch's *Moralia*. Volume I (the first of fourteen volumes). By Frank Cole Babbitt, of Trinity College, Hartford (1927). Pp. xxxv + 468.

The Contents of the Introduction (vii-xxxv) are as follows:

1. Plutarch's Life and Writings (ix-xviii); 2. Bibliography (in general, xviii-xix: [i] The Manuscripts, xix-xxii; [ii] Editions, xxiii-xxvi; [iii] Special Works on Plutarch, xxvi-xxviii; [iv] Translations (xxviii-xxxi); 3. The Traditional Order of the Books of the *Moralia* as they appear in practically all editions since that of Xylander (1570), and their division into volumes in this edition (xxxii-xxxv).

The pieces translated are as follows: The Education of Children (3-69); How the Young Man Should Study Poetry (72-197); On Listening to Lectures (201-259); How To Tell a Flatterer from a Friend (263-395); How a Man May Become Aware of His Progress in Virtue (399-457). To each piece a brief special Introduction is prefixed. There is an Index <Nominum et Rerum> (459-468).

As a specimen of Professor Babbitt's style I give his version of The Education of Children, Chapter 13(9 E-F).

Above all, the memory of children should be trained and exercised; for this is, as it were, a storehouse of learning; and it is for this reason that the mythologists have made Memory the mother of the Muses, thereby intimating by an allegory that there is nothing in the world like memory for creating and fostering. This, then, is to be trained in either case, whether one's children be naturally gifted with a good memory, or, on the contrary, forgetful. For we shall thus strengthen nature's generous endowment, and thus fill out her deficiency; and while the first class of children will excel others, the second class will excel their former selves. The saying of Hesiod is admirably put:

If even small upon the small you place
And do this oft, the whole will soon be great.

Nor should parents forget that those branches of instruction which involve memory make no small contribution, not merely to education, but also to the practical activities of life; for the memory of past activities serves as a pattern of good counsel for the future.

(14) Polybius, *The Histories*, Volumes V-VI (the concluding volumes). By W. R. Paton (1927). Pp. v + 536; v + 468.

In these two volumes Professor Paton was dealing with fragments. In Volume 5 he presents a version of the fragments of Books XVI-XXVII, in Volume 6 a translation of the fragments of Books XXVIII-XXXIX. Each volume has an Index <Nominum>: see 5.524-536, 6.457-468.

For notices of the earlier volumes see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.193, 17.170, 19.167.

(15) The Geography of Strabo. Volume IV (the fourth of eight volumes). By Horace Leonard Jones, of Cornell University (1927). Pp. v + 465.

This volume contains text and translation of Books VIII-IX, and A Partial Dictionary of Proper Names (457-465).

For notices of the earlier volumes see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 12.57, 17.169, 18.181.

(16) Saint Basil, *The Letters*, Volume I (the first of four volumes). By Roy J. Deferrari, of the Catholic University of America (1926). Pp. lv + 366.

Readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* are well aware of the fact that, at the Catholic University of America, a valuable series of Patristic Studies has been in progress, for some years, under the editorship of Professor Roy J. Deferrari. Fifteen volumes have thus far been published:

I. St. Basil and Greek Literature, Leo V. Jacks³ (17.175-176); II. The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Sermons of St. Basil the Great, J. M. Campbell (20.191-192); III. A Study of the Vocabulary and Rhetoric of the Letters of St. Augustine, Sister Wilfrid Parsons (18.213-214); IV. The Syntax of the "De Civitate Dei" of St. Augustine, Sister Mary Columkille Colbert (18.214); V. The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyric Sermons of St. John Chrysostom: A Study in Greek Rhetoric, Thomas E. Ameringer (16.95-96); VI. St. Augustine the Orator. A Study of the Rhetorical Qualities of St. Augustine's "Sermones ad Populum", Sister M. Inviolata Barry (20.94); VII. The Clausulae in the "De Civitate Dei" of St. Augustine, Graham Reynolds (20.64-65); VIII. S. Aurelii Augustini Liber De Catechizandis Rudibus. A Translation with a Commentary, J. P. Christopher; IX. Sancti Ambrosii Oratio De Obitu Theodosii: Text, Translation, Introduction and Commentary, Sister Mary Dolorosa Mannix (20.65-66); X. The Vocabulary

³The references in parentheses are to places in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* where different volumes in the Series have been reviewed.

of the Moral-Ascetical Works of St. Ambrose. A Study in Latin Lexicography, Sister Mary Finbarr Barry; XI. The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom, Frederick Waller Augustine Dickinson; XII. The Latinity of the Letters of Saint Ambrose, Sister Miriam Annunciata Adams; XIII. The Language and Style of the Letters of St. Basil, Sister Agnes Clare Way; XIV. The Syntax of the Confessions of St. Augustine, Sister Mary Raphael Arts; XV. S. Ambrosii De Nabuthae: A Commentary, with an Introduction and Translation, Martin R. P. McGuire.

The initial volume of Professor Deferrari's translation of the Letters of Saint Basil contains a Foreword, by the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward A. Pace, Professor of Philosophy in the Catholic University of America, and Vice-Chancellor of the University (v-vi); Prefatory Note (vii-ix); Table of Contents (xi-xiii); Introduction (xv-lv); Text and Translation of Letters I-LVIII (2-361); Index of Proper Names (363-366).

The Introduction deals with

I. Life of St. Basil (xv-xxxiv: 1. Early Life and Education, xv-xxi, 2. Basil and Monasticism, xxi-xxiii, 3. The Priesthood, xxiv-xxv, 4. Basil and Arianism, xxv-xxxii, 5. Basil as Archbishop, xxxii-xxxiv); II. Some Important Works of St. Basil (xxxv-xxxvi); III. St. Basil's Letters (xxxvi-xxxviii); IV. Table of Dates (xxxix-xl); V. Bibliography (xli-xlv: 1. Manuscripts, xli-xlii, 2. Editions, xlii-xliii, 3. Translations of the Letters, xliii, 4. Miscellaneous Works on St. Basil, xliii-xlv); VI. The Letters of St. Basil Arranged in Parallel Columns According to the Benedictine, and the Older Numbering (xlvi-l); VII. The Letters of St. Basil Arranged in Parallel Columns According to the Older, and the Benedictine Numbering (l-lv).

Of the style of St. Basil, Monsignor Pace writes as follows (vi):

The salient features of his style are the frequent citation of the Scriptures and the use, at every page, of illustration. The former attests not only his familiarity with the sacred text, but also his habit of meditating upon it and his grasp of the meaning. The latter is what one would expect from a native of Cappadocia whose education in Athens had enriched with culture his inherited wealth of imagination. And it is interesting to note how many of the figurative expressions used by St. Basil are lauded to-day in their English form as brilliant results of original picturesque thinking.

Turning now to the Latin side, I make mention of the following volumes:

(17) Cicero, The Speeches: Pro Lege Manilia, Pro Caecina, Pro Cluentio, Pro Rabirio Perduellionis. By H. Grose Hodge, Assistant Master at Charterhouse (1927). Pp. xii + 496.

Mr. Hodge's volume contains a Prefatory Note (v-vi), Summary of Events Referred to in the Four Speeches (ix-xii), the text and the translation of the four speeches (1-491), and Index of Proper Names (493-496). To each speech an Introduction is prefixed (that Introduction includes a picture of the historical background of the speech, and an analysis of its contents, with indications of the limits of divisions): see pages 2-13, 86-95, 208-221, 444-451.

As a specimen of Mr. Grose's translation, I reproduce his version of the opening chapter of the Pro (De) Lege Manilia:

Although it has at all times given me an especial pleasure to behold your crowded assembly, and this place in particular has seemed to me to afford the amplest scope for action, the fairest stage for eloquence, none the less, fellow-citizens, this approach to fame, which the best have ever found most widely open, has hitherto been barred to me, not certainly by any wish of mine, but by that scheme of life which, from my earliest years, I had laid down for myself. For previously, seeing that I was debarred by my youth from aspiring to this proud position and was resolved to bring here nothing but the mature outcome of my talent, the finished product of my industry, I considered that my every hour should be devoted to my friends in their hours of peril. And so, while this platform has never been without fit champions of your cause, the disinterested and blameless employment of my labours in private lawsuits has been crowned by the dignity which your verdict has conferred. For when, owing to the postponement of the elections, my name was thrice proclaimed as heading the poll for the praetorship by the vote of each century in turn, I could not fail to understand, gentlemen, what verdict you were passing upon myself, and what course you were recommending to others. And now, since I possess such a measure of influence as, by conferring office upon me, you have intended should be mine, and such a degree of skill in public speaking as an almost daily practice in pleading can bestow through his experience in the courts upon one anxious to learn, then assuredly any influence that may be mine I will exercise among those to whom I owe it, and any attainments I can achieve as an orator I will display most chiefly <sic/> to those whose verdict has pronounced that oratory, too, is deserving of reward. And I realize that I am especially entitled to congratulate myself upon the fact, that, unaccustomed as I am to the style of oratory that becomes this platform, the cause I have to plead is such as could leave no one at a loss for words. For it is mine to speak of the unique and extraordinary merits of Gnaeus Pompeius, and a speech upon that topic is harder to end than to begin; so that my task as a speaker lies in the search not for material but for moderation.

(18) Cicero, Tusculan Disputations. By J. E. King (1927). Pp. xxxvii + 578.

The Introduction deals at some length (vii-xx) with Cicero as a philosopher. Then comes (xxx) a section entitled Books, of twenty-two lines, ridiculously inadequate alike in substance and in the manner of presentation. No American edition of the Tusculans is mentioned; only two German editions are named. Next come Arguments, i. e. outlines of the several books (with indications of limits of divisions). On pages 550-569 we find a valuable feature, entitled Cicero's Translations from the Greek. Here are printed on parallel pages passages of the Tusculans and their Greek originals. The Index <Nominum et Rerum> covers pages 571-578.

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.161-162, 181, 19.175-176, 184, I called attention to the inadequacy, both of substance and of form, which marks, all too often, the bibliographies in the volumes of the Loeb Classical Library. As an excellent example of the way in which a bibliography should never be presented I transcribe the whole section labelled Books in the volume under review.

Zeller's *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics*, trans. Reichel.

Zielinski, *Cicero in Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, 1912.

Grant's Essay on "The Ancient Stoics," *Ethics of Aristotle*, vol. I.

Introduction, Reid's *Academica*.

Roman Philosophy, R. D. Hicks in *Companion to Latin Studies* and the article on philosophy in *Companion to Greek Studies*, Cambridge Press.

Of editions of the Tusculans published in the British Islands there are those of Davies first printed in 1709, Orelli's Oxford edition of 1834, a translation of Tischer and Sorof by the Rev. T. K. Arnold, and an edition of the first two books by Professor T. W. Dougan¹, Cambridge, 1905. Orelli's Oxford edition contains the emendations of Bentley as well as the lectures of F. A. Wolf and other commentaries upon the Tusculans.

For this translation Klotz, and Baiter and Kayser chiefly have been used for the text, and Kühner (Hanover, 1874) most often consulted for the meaning.

I wonder how long it would take a well trained scholar, even within a great library, to identify, with the needed details of Christian name(s) of authors, names of publishers, places and dates of publication, etc., the volumes and the articles hinted at in the matter just quoted.

As a specimen of Mr. King's powers as a translator I give his version of 1.28 (§§68-70), the famous passage in which, in a great, swelling sentence, Cicero argued, first, that there is a divine providence, and, secondly, that the soul of man is immortal:

Just as when we see first the beauty and the brightness of the sky, then the amazing speed, which our thought cannot grasp, of its revolution, next the succession of day and night and the changes of the seasons divided into four to suit the ripening of the fruits of the earth and the constitution of living bodies, and the sun their ruler and guide, and the moon marking as it were and indicating the days in the calendar by the waxing and waning of her light; then the five stars carried along in the same vault with its twelve divisions, unchangingly keeping the same courses, in spite of the mutual difference of their movements, and the aspect of the heavens at night decked everywhere with stars, then the ball of the earth rising from the sea, set firmly in the center of the universe, habitable and cultivated in two separate zones of which the one in which we dwell is:

Beneath the pole set toward the seven stars from whence

The dreadful North wind whistling drives the frozen snow,

the other, the Southern, unknown to us, called by the Greeks *ἀπ' ἡλίου*: all other parts are uncultivated, because we gather they are either frozen with cold or parched with heat: here, however, where we live, there cease not in due season:

Skies to be shining and trees in leaf blossoming,
Tendrils of joy-giving vines to be burgeoning,
Poison of berries the boughs to be burdening,
Fields to be rich with crops, flowers out everywhere,
Fountains to bubble and grasses the meads cover:

then the vast number of domestic animals used in part for food, in part for tillage, in part for draught, in part for clothing, and man himself formed as it were to observe the heavens and cultivate the soil, and lastly all fields and seas made subject to the service of man—when then we behold all these things and countless others, can we doubt that some being is over them, or some author, if these things have had beginning, as Plato holds, or, if they have always existed, as Aristotle

thinks, some governor of so stupendous a work of construction? So with the mind of man, though thou seest it not, as thou seest not God, nevertheless as thou recognizeest God from His works, so from memory, power of discovery, rapidity of movement and all the beauty of virtue, thou shalt recognize the divine power of mind.

(To be concluded)

CHARLES KNAPP

THE SECOND SALLUSTIAN SUASORIA

The Second Suasoria ascribed to Sallust, commonly called *Ad Caesarem Senem De Republica Epistula*¹, is now treated by German scholars as a genuine work of Sallust. The examination made by F. Novotny² of the *clausulae* in it has provided definite evidence of its stylistic affinity with the genuine works of Sallust. Objections are raised to this view by Mr. Hugh Last, in *The Classical Quarterly* 17 (1923), 87-100, 151-162. I hope to show the weakness of Mr. Last's objections, to clear up certain difficulties of interpretation, and to contribute some new evidence to the case for genuineness.

The date generally accepted for the Epistle, February, 49 B. C., is excluded by several statements of the writer which make it clear that, at the time the Epistle was written, Caesar's course was not yet decided. He had not yet crossed the Rubicon. The letter belongs to the last weeks of 50 B. C. The author is trying to dissuade Caesar from negotiating with the senatorial party and to induce him to come in arms to the rescue of the unfortunate and persecuted democrats³. This date is indicated by several statements.

(1) It is unworthy of Caesar to think only of his own security. He must continue to be the people's champion. Pompey affords armed support to the senatorial enemy. Caesar must use similar methods to restore the balance (2.3-4; 3.1).

Evidently the Rubicon has not yet been crossed.

(2) M. Drusus is mentioned (6.3) to warn Caesar against trusting his opponents. A champion of the people must establish his own party and be on his guard against the wiles of the nobles.

Such fears of compromise between Caesar and his

¹For text and translation of the Epistula see John C. Rolfe, *Sallust with an English Translation*, 462-491 (Loeb Classical Library, 1921). On page xix Professor Rolfe writes as follows of the Second Suasoria: "That Sallust was not the author of the two *suasoriae* is clear from internal evidence; the extensive use of archaic forms suggests the period of Fronto and his school. Although the two pleas have much in common both in language and in subject matter, they were probably not the work of the same writer."

²For the attitude of Aulus Gellius, whose literary tastes were those of Fronto, toward Sallust, see my remarks in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler*, 134-135 (New York, Macmillan and Co., 1894). It was Sallust's love of the archaic that commended him to Gellius. Sallust's love of archaisms has long been known. See e. g. E. S. Schuchburgh on Suetonius, *Augustus* 86 (page 154, column 1), and Suetonius's own words, "... *verbis quae Crispus Sallustius excerpit ex Originibus Catonis*..." See also K. Kraut, *Ueber das Vulgäre Element in der Sprache des Sallustius* (Blaubeuren, 1881), and P. Schultze, *De Archaismis Sallustianis* (Halle, 1871). C. K.

³In *Listy Filologicke* (a philological journal published at Prague), 1918, 257-264. The article is summarized by Kurfess in *Bursian's Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 192.60.

⁴See Eduard Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus*, 558-582 (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1918). In the second edition the matter is discussed on pages 563-588.

⁵This edition has little, if any value: see my notice of the book in *American Journal of Philology* 27 (1906), 111-112.

opponents have a place only before the crossing of the Rubicon.

(3) The nobles are dominant and are persecuting the democrats with a ferocity unequaled by Sulla (3.2-4.3).

This is a picture of Roman politics in 52-50 B.C.

(4) The greatest difficulty in the struggle with the nobles will be to avoid their trickery. Only Cato among them has any courage or talent. But even he can hardly rule successfully; his teachers, the Greeks, have failed to maintain their own liberty (8.6-9.3).

This argument, too, implies that war has not been joined.

(5) Caesar has conquered Gaul. He must now give his attention to the Roman people. This is a solemn duty demanded of him by conscience and by the voice of his country and of his ancestors (12.5-13.7).

(6) Caesar now has many peers. His grandeur will be unique only when he shall have rescued Rome (13.5).

The evidence shows clearly that the writer's purpose is to persuade Caesar to intervene by force of arms. The situation presupposed is that of the year 50 B.C.; the voice is that of a member of the popular party who is violently hostile to the nobles and who sees no hope of defeating them unless Caesar shall resolutely champion the cause of the democrats. Aside from the main purpose, to persuade Caesar to be uncompromising in his opposition, the *Suasoria* contains denunciations of the nobles and a program of constitutional reform.

In discussing this work, we must distinguish between what is conventional rhetoric and what is peculiar to the circumstances of the writer. We must also note that this document is not an academic exercise, but was written in the heat of political strife. It is addressed formally to Caesar, but its message is to political adherents and opponents with the object of inspiring the former by an attack on the latter. It is not unexampled in our own day for partisan documents to be couched in epistolary form. Such ephemeral documents have much the same characteristics in all communities where an appeal may be made to the public. We need not expect to find in the Second *Suasoria* anything in the nature of a personal message.

We can distinguish what is conventional in a *Suasoria* by considering Greek examples of the type. The Letters of Plato are one of Sallust's sources. Among them are models of political *Suasoriae*. A study of the Philippus of Isocrates is also helpful to an understanding of the class of *Suasoriae* addressed to an individual. The Philippus contains Isocrates's programme for an improvement of the condition of Greece. Isocrates declares (12-14) that it is an advantage to embody such a programme in an address to an individual. It is clear that the individual addressed need not give any thought to the document or to its writer, and need not even be in a position to carry out the author's programme. The address to an individual is, after Isocrates, a literary convention. It means exactly as much as the address in an open letter to the Prime Minister or to the President, whether pub-

lished in a newspaper or in a pamphlet. Such a writing is a literary product, for one thing; it is an attack on the political enemy, for another; only remotely does it concern the person to whom it is addressed. The Second *Suasoria*, in its reference to Caesar's ancestors and to his future fame, follows Isocrates (Philippus 113, 142).

So much by way of preface.

Let me now give an abstract of our document. The work is that of a writer who is somewhat incoherent, very dependent on models and tags, but who at least has something pointed to say which would have been quite clear to a contemporary. Here is, summarized chapter by chapter, what he says in the form of an appeal to Caesar.

(1) In spite of the difficulty of advising anyone who has *imperium*, I venture to expose myself to criticism in your interest. I think my own interests less important than yours.

(2) You must consider the interests of the city in connection with any decision you make.

(3) Pompey has, by his military power, put in control a clique of degenerate nobles who are acting tyrannically.

(4) They have gone to greater lengths than Sulla did; they are bent on your downfall at no matter what cost to the country.

(5) You can strengthen the popular party by extending the franchise.

(6) As leader of this party you will have a commanding position. The example of Drusus illustrates the danger of counting upon any loyalty from the nobles.

(7) The power of wealth is a corrupting force. Let rich and poor alike serve on juries, but make the juries larger.

(8) In the election of magistrates, also, let wealth and rank have no special advantage.

(9) The nobles will oppose you, but their weakness is apparent.

(10) The Senate needs reforming. Men of position are a safeguard to the State, and the Senate should, as the repository of wisdom, guide the State. This was the case with our Senate until a worthless faction gained control.

(11) The Senate can be restored, if new members are added and if voting is done by secret ballot.

(12) The details may be left to time and the occasion to decide. The whole project of reform is, however, for you an imperious duty.

(13) The voice of your country and of your ancestors summons you to the task of reform. If you succeed, your glory will be boundless.

Any difficulty in following the thought here outlined arises from the writer's failure to express himself clearly on some points and from his habit of introducing rhetorical tags and commonplaces until they fairly obscure the underlying message. The real interests of the writer seem to me to be plainly those of a contemporary whose political position is that of Sallust.

The mental habits of the writer also suit what we know of Sallust from his extant works. His style is characterized by a bizarre use of models, ancient and foreign, to a degree impossible for a writer of genius. Sallust was a late-learner, who, instead of expressing himself through his own words, uses the words of others to create striking effects that bear little relation to his own outlook on life. Sallust was not only a

fur ineruditissimus (Suetonius, De Grammaticis 15), and a translator from the Greek (Quintilian 9.3.17); his expressed philosophy is never more than a literary pose. He is never a creator, but stands to original literary art in the position of a connoisseur who collects the products of others' genius and arranges them artistically in a museum where they may be admired by other connoisseurs.

The faults of style in the Second Suasoria are those of Sallust. The ideas are those we find expressed in his other works. If we allow for the clumsiness of an apprentice who has taken up his trade late in life, we find that the technique of the Second Suasoria fits into its niche in Sallust's literary activity. Indeed, it would not be easy to imagine a forger endowed with precisely Sallust's rhetorical ineptitude and futility. The ineptitude of forgers is usually somewhat different.

I pass to a consideration of Mr. Last's article. He rightly, I believe, concludes that the First Suasoria is a genuine work of Sallust (The Classical Quarterly 17 [1923], 87-100, 157-162, 18.83-84). The *suasor's* translation of a sentence from the Seventh Platonic Epistle (Suasoria 1.8.2; Epistle 7, 326 B) is the strongest argument for Sallustian authorship, for Sallust elsewhere pillages the Platonic Epistles⁴. Mr. Last cites Sallust, Catilina 3.3, which comes from Ep. 7, 324 B, and Bellum Iugurthinum 3.2, which comes from Ep. 7, 331 C-D. Another such passage, hitherto unnoticed, is found in B. I. 113. 1: Sed plerumque regiae voluntates ut vehementes sic mobiles, saepe ipsae sibi advorsae. This is clearly adapted from Ep. 7, 328 B: αἱ γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαι τῶν τοιούτων ταχεῖαι καὶ πολλάκις ἐναντίαι ἐναντίοι φερόμεναι. To be sure, by τοιούτων Plato means the young, whereas Sallust renders it by *regiae*. Sallust, however, need not have misunderstood his source; he might easily alter a word for his own purposes.

In any case Sallust's use of these passages throws a good deal of light on his literary method. He culls the literature with which he is acquainted for striking phrases, which he fits into his work as best he can. As a rule the result is faulty. The sententious remark about the desires of kings has very little point. Even less point is there in Catilina 3.3, where he says, Sed ego adulescentulus initio sicuti plerique studio ad rem publicam latus sum, ibique mihi multa advorsa fuere. The language of Plato in the mouth of Sallust moves the spleen. It is obvious that Sallust must not be criticized as a literary genius, but for what he evidently is, a collector of the artistic products of others.

With these things in mind let us turn our attention to some of Mr. Last's objections to the view that the Second Suasoria was written by Sallust. In regard

to the use of *multipliciter* (17.95) and other expressions not found in the Latin of Sallust's day, one may well urge that just such innovations are to be expected from a writer who has his eye on foreign models. With regard to the passage quoted from 2.4.1 (17.95) it seems possible to suggest a plausible explanation that has apparently not occurred to scholars. I venture to indicate what seems to me obviously the correct punctuation.

L. Sulla, cui omnia in victoria lege belli licuerunt, tametsi supplicio hostium partis suas muniri intellegebat, tamen paucis interfectis ceteros beneficio quam metu retinere maluit. At hercule a M. Catone, L. Domitio, ceterisque eiusdem factionis quadraginta senatores, multi praeterea cum spe bona adulescentes sicuti hostiae mactati sunt. Quom interea importunissima genera hominum tot miserorum civium sanguine satiari nequiverunt, non orbi liberi, non parentes exacta aetate, non luctus gemitus virorum mulierum immanem eorum animum inflexit, quin acerbis in dies male faciundo ac dicundo dignitate alios, alios civitate eversum irent.

The expression *sicuti hostiae mactati sunt* suggests not death in any kind of a battle or riot, but an execution in cold blood. Compare Catilina 58.21, *sicuti pecora*. Now, at least two senators (Lentulus and Cethegus) were so executed by Cicero during the Catilinarian Conspiracy, and their death was due to Cato as much as to anyone. Domitius was probably a member of the Senate at the time. In any case, the party of Cato and Domitius was responsible for the execution. But here are no forty senators! To be sure, but the writer thinks of the Catilinarian affair as a single act, and so he includes among the forty those slain with Catiline in battle as well as the numerous Catilinarians who were brought to trial. It is a natural partisan exaggeration to state that the forty were all slain like victims. In any case, to a Catilinarian it was not absurd to compare the Ciceronian executions and prosecutions with the proscriptions of Sulla. Sulla, however, had taken no steps against his opponents after the proscriptions were over. Not so Cato and Domitius, who continued to harass their opponents by expulsion from office and by exile. In this, certainly, Cato and Domitius did go further than Sulla. The statement is a partisan statement, but there is point in it. The writer is merely concerned to show, by exaggeration if necessary, that Cato and Domitius are worse than Sulla. The argument is just about as important as most political arguments. But why is Cicero not mentioned, if the reference is really to the days of his consulship? Because the writer has no concern with history. He wants to make the worst of Cato and Domitius. Cicero is not definitely an enemy. In any case he is not a leader, and the writer is attacking the leaders of the other party. The effect of this passage is strongly to confirm one's belief in the contemporary composition of this writing.

Mr. Last's objection (17.98) to the statement (2.9.3), Unius tamen M. Catonis ingenium, versutum, loquax, callidum haud contemno, has no proper basis at all. The writer is far from praising Cato here; he concedes

⁴I adopt Mommsen's conjecture.

⁴<IN THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.173-174 Professor Paul Shorey reviewed R. Hackforth, The Authorship of the Platonic Epistles (Manchester, The University Press, 1913). Professor Shorey utterly declined to regard the 'Platonic Epistles' as Plato's work. Professor Post has published a volume entitled Thirteen Epistles of Plato, Introduction Translation, and Notes (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1925). In his Introduction, I. Genuineness of the Letters (1-5), Professor Post holds that the genuineness of Epistles 3, 7, 8, "which are the really important ones", has been vindicated "against the most minute tests". In the Introductions to the several Epistles Professor Post argues also for the genuineness of Epistles 2, 4, 6, 10, 11, and, less confidently, of 13. C. K.>

that Cato, unlike the stupid Bibulus and the vicious Domitius, has the talents of a good lawyer. Surely this is damning with faint praise, exactly the method adopted in Catilina 54. Even the skill of Cato is nullified because it has been learned of the Greeks. Says the *suasor* (*ibidem*):

...Parantur haec disciplina Graecorum. Sed virtus, vigilantia, labor apud Graecos nulla sunt. Quippe qui domi libertatem suam per inertiam amiserint, censes eorum praeceptis imperium haberi posse?

This is sufficiently Sallustian. Compare B. I. 85.32, where Marius says, Neque litteras Graecas didici: parum placebat eas discere, quippe quae ad virtutem doctoribus nihil profuerant.

Mr. Last (17.98) thinks it almost incredible that Sallust, or indeed any educated man who lived during the Caesarian period, should have written words like those at the beginning of 2.5: In duas partis ego civitatem divisam arbitror, sicut a maioribus accepi, in patres et plebem. But that is exactly the way Sallust did write, as anyone may see. Compare Macer's oration (from the Histories), the oration of Memmius (B. I. 31), and the message of Manlius (Catilina 33). A work that did not mention the secessions of the *plebs* from the *patres* might well for that very reason be considered un-Sallustian. It may be added that the *suasor*'s use of *populus* and *plebs* as synonymous is another Sallustian touch. Compare the preface to Marius's speech in B. I. 85 with the postscript. We have, before the speech, *contionem populi advocavit*, after it, *postquam plebis animos arrectos videt*.

In his next paragraph (17.98), Mr. Last makes difficulties by refusing to see the plain meaning of the Latin (2.8.2): Ita coaequantur dignitate, pecunia, virtute anteire alius alium properabit. The meaning is, 'In this way, distinctions based on rank and wealth being removed, they will be eager to excel one another in virtue'. The use of the ablative of specification is normal. The meaning is, perhaps, somewhat obscured by brevity, but this brevity is decidedly characteristic of Sallust.

It is, perhaps, enough to say of Mr. Last's remaining arguments that they are based upon certain quite groundless assumptions: (1) that Sallust had a trained mind, that he was anything but a skillful polisher of epigrammatic phrases; (2) that Sallust expected Caesar to consider his writings seriously as anything but partisan ephemeral literature; (3) that Caesar, when he had a practical use for a man, cared whether he was inept as a writer or not; (4) that such a vague rhetorical work as the one under consideration must deal with a particular situation with the accuracy and the dispatch of a trained statesman.

In particular I fail to comprehend Mr. Last's objections (17.154) to the language of 2.13. The device of putting an exhortation into the mouth of an apparition summoned for the purpose is particularly Platonic. It is employed at the end of the Menexenus and of Epistle 8. If the numerous forefathers can speak in chorus, as they do in the Menexenus, it seems a small addition to include Caesar's *patria*. Perhaps Plato,

Crito 51 C, where the Laws declare to Socrates that they begot him, was in Sallust's mind when he made country and parents say to Caesar, ...*nos te genuimus, fortissimi viri, in optima urbe*. Such boldness is surely not unworthy of Sallust. Neither do I see why Caesar's country and parents should not refer to the *honestae divitiae* which they had bequeathed to him (17.99). In any case, if either Caesar or Sallust was ashamed of wealth, however obtained, the fact is not on record. As to the frequent mention of *libertas* in the Second Suasoria (17.156), the *suasor* happens to be urging Caesar to free the people from the domination of a clique. The word appears with equal frequency in Macer's speech (from the Histories).

With regard to Mr. Last's interpretation of the parallel passages in the First and Second Suasoriae (17.151-157), it is only necessary to say that it is quite characteristic of Sallust to serve up the same idea over and over again in slightly differing form, and that it would not be surprising if such a collector of tags were, like Oscar Wilde, to use the same material twice, especially in work of quite ephemeral interest. In any case, he could fall back on the example and the excuse of Isocrates. The truth is that the ideas and the expressions of both Suasoriae are remarkably Sallustian, and that, too, though there is very slight evidence of copying. Mr. Last's forger is both too clever and too stupid to be plausible. Note, for instance, how one idea is treated from opposite angles in 2.10.4-5 and Catilina 37.3. The idea is, as usual, Platonic. Compare 2.7-8, Postremo, ubi divitiae clarae habentur, ibi omnia bona vilia sunt, fides, probitas, pudor, pudicitia, with Catilina 10.4, Namque avaritia fidem, probitatem, ceterasque artis bonas subvertit. It would be like a forger to copy or to adapt a sentence, but hardly like a forger to expand an idea in a different form while he remained Sallustian in style.

If the Second Suasoria is to be declared definitely un-Sallustian, more convincing arguments than have yet appeared must be brought forward. On the other hand, it is undoubtedly difficult to present a demonstration of the genuineness of the work. It is, I believe, possible to use a method employed by Mr. Last in connection with the First Suasoria, to incline the balance in favor of genuineness, that is, a study of the Greek authors used by the *suasor*. According to Teuffel's History of Roman Literature (English Translation, by G. C. W. Warr, of the fifth German edition, London, George Bell and Sons, 1891), 1. 368 (§ 206.7), Sallust utilizes the following Greek sources: Plato, Menexenus and Epistle 7; Xenophon, Cyropaedia and Memorabilia; the orations of Thucydides and Demosthenes.

The case for the Second Suasoria is not supported by any evidence so striking as the obvious use by the First Suasoria of Plato, Epistle 7. There is, nevertheless, evidence that establishes a strong probability that the author of the Second Suasoria wove reminiscences of Plato and Xenophon into his work in much the same way as the author of the First did. The latter, for example, is thinking of Xenophon's Hiero as he writes. In 1.1.5 the sentiment comes from Hiero 5.1; in 1.1.

6 it comes from Hiero 11.7 (*eniti* echoes ἀγῶνα); the statement, nam pessimus quisque asperrime rectorem patitur, is implied in Hiero 10.2-3. Again, the sentiment in 1.3.2 sums up a long passage of the Hiero (2.7-18). It is pretty certain that we have here a trustworthy clue to Sallust's use of his sources. One could cite similar examples from the Catilina and the Bellum Jugurthinum, but it is more to the point to show that the two Suasoriae resemble each other and that they stand or fall together.

Compare the use of the sources in the Second Suasoria. It is probable that the phrase *nullius potentia super leges erat* (2.5.3) is a reminiscence of Plato, Ep. 7, 334 C, and Ep. 8. 354 C, οὐκ ἀνθρώποι τύραννοι νόμων. There is clearer evidence of a use of Ep. 8. 355 A-B, in the sentence (2.7.10), *Ergo in primis auctoritatem pecuniae demito*, where *in primis* echoes πάντων πρώτων.

Many of the commonplaces about wealth and pleasure and the rise and the downfall of nations have parallels in Plato, Laws, and in Xenophon, Cyropaedia, but these are too vague to prove much. There is one passage (2.7.6) which seems to derive from Plato's account of the oligarchic man and his son in Republic, Book 7:

...nam ubi bonus deteriore divitiis magis clarum magisque acceptum videt, primo aestuat multaque in pectore volvit, sed ubi gloria honorem magis in dies, virtutem opulentia vincit, animus ad voluptatem a vero deficit.

There is evidence of the use of Plato, Menexenus, in both Suasoriae. In the First, the striking sentence (1.5.2), Aliter non orbis terrarum neque cunctae gentes conglobatae movere aut contundere queunt hoc imperium, is almost certainly based on Menexenus 243 D. Here we have, perhaps, the original source of Shakespeare's well-known lines at the end of King John: "Come the three corners of the world in arms And we shall shock them. Naught shall make us rue If England to itself do rest but true". The passage from the Second Suasoria (2.8.2) already referred to Ita coaequantur dignitate, pecunia, virtute anteire alius alium properabit, also derives from Plato's Menexenus: see 238 D.

I have kept what I consider the strongest evidence to the last. In 2.1.3 we read as follows:

Sed mihi studium fuit adulescentulo rem publicam capessere, atque in ea cognoscenda multam magnamque curam habui, non ita ut magistratum modo cape-rem, quem multi malis artibus adepti erant, sed etiam ut rem publicam domi militiaeque quantumque armis, viris, opulentia posset cognitum habuerim.

The first clause, like Catilina 3. 3, is a reminiscence of Plato, Ep. 7, 324 B-C. The rest of the passage is practically an epitome of Xenophon, Memorabilia 3.6, which was almost certainly in the writer's mind as he wrote.

Now, in Xenophon Glaucon stands for his brother Plato, the philosopher. The story that Glaucon insisted on addressing the people though he was laughed at and dragged from the *bema* is an allegory of what happened to Plato, and Xenophon's criticism of Plato follows. One wonders whether Sallust or his teachers

had observed this. In any case, it is hardly doubtful that the author of the Second Suasoria was utilizing the Memorabilia.

Since that author also uses the Menexenus and the Epistles of Plato, he evidently not only has a mastery of Sallust's style; he has the same acquaintance with literature and the same method of utilizing it that Sallust and the author of the First Suasoria had. If there were any telling arguments against the genuineness of the Suasoriae, the evidence that I have presented might fail to convince. There are, however, no such arguments in the case of the Second Suasoria any more than in that of the First, as I have tried to show. The very fact, moreover, that careful scrutiny has failed to detect clear evidence of forgery affords in itself in the case of a work as peculiar as this a strong presumption of genuineness. The evidence I have presented from use of sources, is, perhaps, enough to incline the scale of judgment definitely in favor of awarding the palm of authorship to Sallust.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE,
HAVERFORD, PA.

L. A. POST

Papyrusbriefe aus der Frühesten Römerzeit. By Bror Olsson. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells (1925). Pp. xii + 240.

Dr. Olsson's monograph, Papyrusbriefe aus der Frühesten Römerzeit, is a doctoral dissertation which any teacher would be delighted to have written by a well-trained pupil. The author, an intelligent, alert, painstaking student of Otto Lagercrantz, has turned out a beautifully finished piece of work. His purpose is to make available a representative selection of letters from the Greek papyri written under the Roman Empire. His work is, then, a supplement of Stanislaus Witkowski, Epistulae Privatae Graecae (Leipzig, Teubner, 1911), which is confined to letters of the Ptolemaic period. Dr. Olsson has set arbitrarily the limits 30 B. C. to 100 A. D. Within these limits he has given full texts of eighty letters, arranged chronologically. The contents of the book are as follows: Introduction (1-23), texts (24-214), and the full Indices customary in publications of papyri (215-239): I. Monate, 215; II. Feste, 215; III. Geographische Namen, 215-216; IV. Götter, 216; V. Römische Kaiser, 216; VI. Personennamen, 217-219; VII. Wortindex, 219-234; VIII. Grammatisches Register, 234-237; IX. Index der Wichtigsten Behandelten und Emendierten Stellen, 237-238; Quellenverzeichnis, 239.

The Introduction gives a useful summary of the theory and the practice of ancient letter-writing. The definition of a letter, that it is written for a limited audience in the conversational rather than in the literary language (1-2), is followed by a treatment of the evolution of certain conventional phrases used in letters. Dr. Olsson points out here that the Greek letter-form and many of its expressions are derived from the ancient Egyptian, just as the Roman in turn are derived from the Greek (3-6). From some points of view this section is not entirely satisfactory. To

take representative phrases from letters written in different languages and at different periods and to maintain that certain similarities in phraseology are indicative of a common origin is very dangerous. It is true that certain phrases in the Greek letters and in the ancient Egyptian examples do offer parallelisms, but it is also true that they express very common ideas. It would not be difficult to find in modern English letters expressions such as *διδὼ οὖν γράφω σοι, ἵνα εἴδῃς*, with which Dr. Olsson finds a parallel (5-6) in ancient Egyptian ("Dies ist geschrieben, damit mein Herr es wisse"), or *καλῶς ποιήσεις γράψας μοι περὶ τῆς ὑγίειας* ("Schreibe mir doch, wie es mit Deiner Gesundheit steht"), or *μὴ ἀγωνιάσῃς* ("Mach Dir keine Sorgen um mich!"), or *ἐκομισάμην τὴν παρὰ σοῦ ἐπιστολήν, ἣν ἀναγνοῦς ἐχάρην* ("Als Dein Brief zu mir kam, freute ich mich sehr"). I am informed that even the Russian, which surely can have no immediate connection with the ancient Egyptian, would admit with perfect propriety any one of these expressions in an ordinary conversational letter.

There follows a short but interesting discussion of the conservative tendency exerted by teachers, professional scribes, and theorists (6-10), and some treatment of the content of letters, i. e. their social nature, humor, and the literary culture which they indicate (11-14). The Introduction ends with an explanation of writing materials and methods of addressing, dating, and mailing letters (14-21).

Aside from its convenience as a collection of the correspondence of the Greeks under the Roman Empire, the work is no mere collation of previously published letters, but amounts practically to a new edition, with many revised readings and additional scholarly notes. An examination of P. Fay. 117¹ in its original edition and in Dr. Olsson's (here numbered 59, pages 168-172) will serve as an example of the extent to which Dr. Olsson has improved the original text and interpretation. His work is characterized throughout by active intelligence, by keen insight into the meaning of difficult passages, and by a refreshingly open mind toward the established text.

The following aspects seem to me to deserve especial mention. Dr. Olsson has read widely in the literature and gives excellent full notes with convenient citations of parallel passages. His interest is primarily, though not exclusively, linguistic. Very many of the notes deal thoroughly with points of grammatical or syntactical usage, and the *Grammatisches Register* (234-237) offers at once a convenient index to the notes and an indication of the extent of the author's emphasis on linguistics. As an example of his shrewd insight into the meaning of words, especially in difficult contexts, I may cite his treatment of P. Oxy. 294.24, 25², where he

suggests the translation, 'With regard to the plot called "Baldhead" <φαλακρός>, write me how it has been planted again at the top with vegetables <λαλαχέυται>', to displace that of the editors, "Let me hear about our bald friend, how his hair is growing again on the top" (67: compare notes to Nos. 5.11, 7.13-14, 13.5, 17.9, 41.8, 52.29). In fact, he has taken considerable pains to point out errors in the work of his predecessors. He is not awed by the prestige of the greatest of the editors of Greek papyri. Schubart (28, 94), Jouguet (31), and Meyer (115) are all of them convicted, rather gleefully, of mistranslation. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt themselves are accused of misconceptions of ideas (56, 67, 77, 201); and for errors in grammar and syntax Johnson-Martin-Hunt (81), Milligan (94), Meyer (114), and Grenfell-Hunt (181) are rebuked with all the gusto of a young man giving his elders well-deserved correction. More than once he suggests new interpretations of familiar passages—see for example his excellent note on τὸ δρθριον (38). His new readings are abundant. The *Apparatus Criticus*, which is admirable throughout, is especially productive in Nos. 9, 17, 31, 38, 41, 52, 57, 64, 76. His sensitiveness to the nuances of the Greek language is shown by many minute but important corrections in the accepted texts. Examples are *καὶ γὰρ* for *καὶ <ε>γὰρ* (64), *eis Ἀλεξάνδρεα* for *eis Ἀλεξάνδρεα <ν>*, with a note on the use of *eis* with the dative (72), and *οὐ κρατῶι* for *οὐ κρατῶι* (187).

With the exception of the paper cover, which is perhaps inevitable in such a work, the book is an admirable example of the printer's art. The typography is excellent, the proof-reading almost impeccable. There are a few slight errors which may be pointed out here. Lines 9 and 10 of No. 55 are omitted in the translation (162); there is no reference (150) for Professor Westermann's article, *An Egyptian Farmer*³; Grenfell's first name, Bernard, is Teutonicized in the abbreviation (57) to "Bernh."; and, finally, there are several clumsy references to the Rev. Mr. Alexander LeMarchant, M. A., of Bolton, who appears in each citation in a different form, the last one (204) being "Revd., M. A., Le Marchant, Bolton".

But these are venial errors, and the author may be congratulated that there are so few of them. As a result of his painstaking, intelligent work the reader who is interested in the social life of the Greeks under the early Roman Empire has now at his command a definitive text of eighty of the most important documents of that period. We could hope for nothing better than that Dr. Olsson follow up this work with an edition of the letters of the second to the fourth centuries A. D.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.

¹*Papyrus Towns and Their Papyri*, Edited by B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and D. G. Hogarth, 272-273 (London, Egypt Exploration Fund, 1900).

²*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Edited with Translations and Notes, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, 2.294-296 (London, Egypt Exploration Fund, 1899).

³*Classical Studies in Honor of Charles Forster Smith*, By his Colleagues. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 3 (Madison, 1919). <For a review of this volume see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13.183-184. C. K.>